Mr. Thomas Manjuran:—I beg to move under Standing Order 42 that the Bill may be taken up and passed on Thursday.

Mr. C. J. Mathew:—Sir, I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Cochin Press and Registration of Books Regulation Amendment Bill.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran:—Sir, I beg to present the Select Committee Report on the Cochin Press and Registration of Books Regulation Amendment Bill. This Bill as originally framed was somewhat more drastic in some ways and less so in others. As the Bill now stands, I must say that every Hon'ble Member here will admit that, as compared to similar legislation existing anywhere else in India, the present attempt is of a very innocuous and innocent character. No charge of reactionarism will be attributed to this measure, which I am sure will be conceded to be the feeblest attempt to introduce any sort of control over the press. The Hon'ble Members who constituted the Select Committee in fact readily realised the truth of that statement when they thought, at any rate a majority of them thought, that the Bill did not go far enough. An amendment was proposed by some of the Non-official Members of the Committee to clause 6 of the Bill and was accepted. The Hon'ble Members can easily imagine the mildness and reasonableness of the original Bill when it is seen that the Non-official Members themselves thought it necessary to strengthen some of the provisions contained in the Bill. With regard to the first 5 sections there was absolutely no controversy whatsoever. They contain provisions to the effect that the name of the editor should be published on the front page of the journals edited by them. Such a law has been existing in British India and Travancore for ever so long and I am sure no reasonable person will have any objection to raise against that proposal. It is only proper that the editor's name should be known to every one that reads the paper. It is only proper that the editor's identity should be easily available. And very naturally with regard to the first 5 Sections there was no controversy whatever and the Bill stands as it originally stood with regard to those Sections. There was some trouble with regard to Section (6) of the Bill and in fact with regard to the other Sections of the Bill also. It was pointed out by some of the Hon'ble Members that the restriction proposed by the original Bill viz., restriction of the transmission through Anchal of books or papers coming under

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

this description, i. e., "books or newspapers wherever printed and published, which contains, or which has on its cover, any words, marks or designs of an indecent, obscene, seditious scurrilous, threatening or grossly offensive character", may not be quite adequate. They advocated the introduction of restrictions against transmission of material through other media also. It is obvious that restricting the passage through Anchal may not be of much use if free circulation is allowed otherwise. The scope of Section 21 of the Bill which is contained in clause 6 was hence extended a little. That section, as it stands now, reads thus:—"No person shall send by Anchal or circulate in any other manner or deliver for circulation to any agency or person whatsoever any book or newspaper wherever printed and published which contains or which has on its cover any words, marks, or designs of an indecent, obscene, seditious, scurrilous, threatening or grossly offensive character. Any book or newspaper sent, delivered or circulated in contravention of the above prohibition and after a warning has been given to the party so sending, delivering or circulating or who intends to send, deliver or circulate, may, under the authority of the Government be detained or captured and retained and disposed of as the Government think proper". Now, as against that, a definite departure from the original Bill was adopted by introducing a warning clause. It was pointed out by some Hon'ble Members that it may be rather hard upon those people who circulate literature, to be suddenly taken to task for selling matter the contents of which they may not be well aware of. So it was thought that a warning clause may be introduced. That in fact was a serious departure from the original Bill. Since non-official Members expressed a strong desire the Committee accepted the proposed amendment with the result that we have now got a warning clause, see the latter portion of section 21. "Any book or newspaper sent, delivered or circulated in contravention of the above prohibition and after a warning has been given to the party so sending, delivering or circulating or who intends to sell, deliver or circulate, may under the authority of the Government be detained or captured and retained and disposed of as the Government think proper".

"*Explanation (1).* The warning referred to in this section may be given by the District Magistrate or by any other officer who is generally or specially empowered by the Government to do so and the warning shall be given in writing and any record kept by the person, so authorised to give warning to the effect that any person has been given such warning will be conclusive evidence of the fact that such warning has been duly given".

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

"*Explanation (2).* The Government may authorise the Anchal Masters or such other Government servants or class of Government servants as they choose to effect the detention or capture and retention of books or newspapers mentioned in this section".

Such a warning was thus introduced into the Bill. Then comes the question. Suppose the condemnation of some particulars of literature was wrong. It may happen that the executive officers authorised under explanation (2) retains articles—that retention itself has to be effected at the instance of orders issued by the Government—supposing those orders are not correct, some relief ought to be given to the parties attempting to transmit the detained literature. Some provisions altogether new, were introduced, by way of safeguards to meet such cases. We have this in section 23. I shall read Section 23: Proviso 1. "Provided that any person interested in any article under the provisions of section 21 may within 2 months from the date of such detention apply to the Government for release of the same and the Government shall consider such application and pass such orders thereon as they may deem to be proper".

Proviso 2. "Provided also that if such application is rejected, the applicant may, within two months from the date of the order rejecting the application apply to the Chief Court for release of the article and its contents on the ground that the article did not contain any book or newspaper containing any matter referred to in section 21".

President:—We shall now adjourn.

The House rose for lunch at 2 P. M. and met again at 3 P. M. with Mr. A. Sankara Menon in the chair.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran:—Sir, I was dealing with section 23 of the Bill before the House rose for lunch. The second proviso of the section and the third clause attached to that proviso provide adequate safeguards with regard to the possibility of the powers derived under the Bill being abused. There will be an appeal to the Chief Court and the decision of the Chief Court will be final. The House will remember that when we go into the existing law in our neighbouring State a remarkable change is found. A very different state of affairs exists there. I shall just give a very brief summary of the law that exists in British India and in our neighbouring State of Travancore. With regard to most other Indian States the law is more stringent than what exists in Travancore. Travancore law is more or less on the lines that exist in British India. In

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Travancore two enactments exist, one is the Press Regulation II of 1079 which corresponds more or less to our Regulation VII of 1097 which is now proposed to be amended and the other is the Newspaper Regulation V of 1101. In the Regulation II of 1079, that is the Press Regulation, there exist provisions corresponding to our new section, i. e., sections 9 and 21 about the circulation of objectionable matter. The Newspaper Regulation V of 1101 is of a very far-reaching nature. Practically every newspaper functioning in Travancore has to furnish security before starting publication, which, Hon'ble Members will realise is a very serious matter. In British India such a law existed requiring all newspapers to furnish security. That law was, however, repealed in the year 1922. But by the flux of time it was found that some other law was necessary there and what is called the Indian Press Emergency Powers Act of 1931 was passed. Under that Act newspapers publishing appeals to violence, communal or otherwise, may be required to deposit a security and that security can be forfeited in certain cases. So the result is that in British India, although a wholesale Regulation which existed formerly, under which all newspapers had to furnish security, has been repealed, subsequently another law was introduced which law is to this day in force and under which law if newspapers incite the public to acts of violence security could be taken from them. We are not going even to that extent. No idea of taking security has been introduced in our Bill. It is anticipated and fervently hoped that the Press of this State will so conduct themselves as never to compel the Government to introduce any such measure. As a matter of fact the law that is now introduced is only intended to prevent the spread of the sort of journalism which has been the subject-matter of repeated complaints in this House by the non-official members. Hon'ble Members will remember that for the last year or so there has been a crop of ephemeral journalism consisting of Journals like the 'Vikatan', 'Sarasan' and so on which published grievous attacks on a large number of persons including some of the Hon'ble Members themselves.

Mr. K. Ayyappan:—Do those papers still exist?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran:—Some of them even now linger on. Even assuming that they are all dead, there is no guarantee that other such will not be started. With an investment of a few rupees one can always print a leaflet containing all sorts of scurrilous, obscene and indecent matter and circulate it in the State. It is this sort of thing that we want to prevent. More established papers will be left undisturbed if the present fairly satisfactory state of affairs continue.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Have not the Government dealt with such papers even without the aid of the present Bill?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran:—Government have attempted to prosecute them. But they consider that prevention is better than cure. I am sure the Hon'ble Member who himself had occasion to be severely and scurrilously criticised by some of these irresponsible journals will appreciate the position of the Government. I do not know how the Hon'ble Members would like obscene matter wholesale being written about women and other parties who could not successfully defend themselves. Such scurrilous literature has to be put down and it is expected that this measure to a certain extent will put it down successfully. I may at once submit further that any newspaper conducted on anything like decent lines will have nothing to fear from this legislation. What is it that is attempted to be prevented is made clear by section 21. I am sure no Hon'ble Member of this House will show any sympathy for people who publish this sort of rubbish. I think that everybody will admit that such a piece of legislation is highly necessary for putting down such kind of publications. I remember to have read attacks against practically every one assembled in this House and all sorts of scurrilous and insinuating observations have been broad-casted against every Member of this House and every Member of the Travancore legislature, and several other public men. It is to stop that sort of filth from spreading that this legislation is intended. I am sure the Hon'ble Members will enthusiastically support this measure which is only intended to prevent their fair name from the depredation of such worthless scandal-mongers. I can quite understand that the case will be different if reputed journals are interfered with. As a matter of fact they are not to be interfered with at all. Suppose for instance it is a measure under which security is to be demanded, then that would be a measure under which every newspaper will suffer. Here on the other hand the respectable journals are safely left alone. Their safety and privileges will continue undisturbed if they continue to conduct their papers on the lines they have been so far following. I am sure longstanding and reputable papers will never descend to this level of personal and scurrilous attacks against respectable people. I do not wish to make a longer speech on the matter. I wish only to say that we are only introducing the minimum of protective measures, measures intended to protect the public against the devastating activities of these filthy minded people. No respectable journal will come under the ambit of this Legislation and even if they are interfered with they can always appeal to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the Chief Court which will surely mete out justice. In these circumstances I would exhort the Hon'ble Members to extend their willing approbation to this Bill. I therefore move that the Bill may be taken into consideration.

Mr. C. J. Mathew:—I second it.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.—Sir, I beg leave to move that the Bill be recommitted. The reasons for my motion to recommit the Bill are amply given in the dissenting minutes of three of the members of the Select Committee. I think I may read a portion of it for the attention of the House and my case, I hope, is a very self-evident one.

"I am of opinion that no convincing case has been made out for passing sections 6, 7 and 8".

"I concur with the view of the Cochin Journalists Association that 'there is no reason why the Press of Cochin should be penalised for the indiscretion of some editors who can be corrected by other means'. The appearance of a few scurrilous journals was a passing and temporary phenomenon brought about by a peculiar circumstance viz., the abstention movement in Travancore. It has disappeard after a few months' existence; and it was the force of public opinion that greatly contributed to its disappearance. It is this healthy public opinion that should mainly be relied on for the suppression of such rare unhealthy growths in the body of the press in such a civilized and highly literate State as Cochin."

He goes on like that giving very salient points against the passing of this Bill. My submission is even granting that there are some objectionable journals in Cochin, the best and most civilized method, according to me, is not to bring rigorous penalising measures. Cochin, even according to the Government, is a very highly cultured and civilized country. Therefore it does not lie in their mouth to say that because Travancore and British are adopting similar repressive measures, we must also follow suit. I think there they commit themselves to a very glaringly inconsistent proposition by saying at one breath that Cochin is far ahead, highly civilised and full of educated people and at the next breath by saying that she must be repressed with penal laws of this magnitude. As some of us on this side have had occasion to say in these matters counter-propaganda is the best remedy. By counter-propaganda all such contingencies could be met and a Government so ably manned as the Cochin Government is, with the support of the public opinion for which it is very famous,—of course, according to themselves—I think, can realise the object in no time. As far as I am aware, the whole country is against the passing of this

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

measure. There have been ever so many monster public meetings to protest against this measure and they have all sent in their resolutions to the Government with a marked zeal as would show that they do not welcome this measure. With these remarks I recommend to the House to recommit this Bill to the Select Committee.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.— സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ക്രാങ്ങന്നൂർ മെമ്പറുടെ അഭിപ്രായത്തെ ഞാൻ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നു. ലാമെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞ രണ്ടു സംഗതികളെപ്പറ്റി മാത്രമെ എനിക്ക് ഇവിടെ പുതുതായി പറയുവാനുള്ളൂ. മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ ഇതിനേക്കാൾ ശക്തി ഏറിയ നിയമങ്ങൾ ഇരിക്കുന്നു എന്ന് അദ്ദേഹം പറയുന്നു. ഗവർമ്മേൻറും ഗവർമ്മേൻറും ജ്യേഷ്ഠാനുജത്വം ചമഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളുക. ഞങ്ങൾക്ക് ആ കാര്യത്തിൽ തർക്കമൊന്നുമില്ല. ഇതിലും കഠിനമായ നിയമങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടെന്നു പറഞ്ഞ ആ രാജ്യത്തെ പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായം എങ്ങിനെയിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നാണ് നോക്കേണ്ടത്. ബ്രിട്ടീഷിൻഡ്യയിലും തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലും ജനദ്രോഹകരമായ പ്രസ്സ് നിയമങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നപ്പോൾ അവിടത്തെ ഗവർമ്മേൻറിനെ ജനങ്ങൾ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കയാണ് ഉണ്ടായത്. എന്നിട്ടും ആ പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായത്തെ അനാവശ്യമായി അവഗണിച്ചിട്ടാണ് അവിടെ ആ നിയമങ്ങൾ നടപ്പാക്കിയത്. മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ പൊതുജനാഭിപ്രായത്തിനെതിരായി പാസാക്കിയ നിയമം കൊച്ചീ രാജ്യത്തും കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതു് ഗവർമ്മേൻറ് പുറത്തുള്ള അവരുടെ ജ്യേഷ്ഠന്മാക്കൊ അനുജന്മാക്കൊ ഒരു സഹായം ചെയ്തുകൊടുത്തില്ലെങ്കിൽ അതു വല്ലാതെയിരിക്കുമല്ലൊ എന്നുവെച്ചായിരിക്കണം.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.— Certainly not.

മിസ്റ്റർ അയ്യപ്പൻ.— മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ ഉള്ളതുകൊണ്ടു ഈ നിയമങ്ങൾ ഇവിടെ പകർത്തണമെന്നില്ല. മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങൾ പിഴച്ച വഴിയെ പോയാൽ നമ്മളും എന്തിനു അങ്ങിനെ പോകുന്നു?

മിസ്റ്റർ തോമാസ്സ് മാഞ്ഞൂരാൻ.— ഏന്നു പറഞ്ഞില്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.— മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങളിൽ നല്ലതു ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതിനെയാണ് നാം പകർത്തേണ്ടതു്. ഈമാതിരി അനാവശ്യങ്ങൾ പകർത്തേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല.

പിന്നെ ഇവിടെ ചില പത്രങ്ങളുടെ കാര്യത്തെപ്പറ്റി പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. പത്രങ്ങളിൽ എഴുതുന്ന അസംബന്ധങ്ങളെ തടയുവാൻവേണ്ടി നമുക്ക് ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു റഗുലേഷൻ കൊണ്ടുവരേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. ആ മാതിരി പത്രങ്ങളുടെ നേർക്കായിരിക്കയില്ല ഈ നിയമം ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതു്. ന്യായമായും നിസ്പാർത്ഥമായും പൊതുജനത്തെ മുൻനിറുത്തി ഗവർമ്മേൻറിൻെറ ന്യൂനതകളെ അടിസ്ഥാനമാക്കി ഗവർമ്മേൻറിനെ ആക്ഷേപിക്കുന്നവരുടെ നേർക്കായിരിക്കാം ഈ നിയമം പ്രയോഗിക്കുന്നതു്. ഇവിടത്തെ ചില പത്രങ്ങളിൽ ചില അസംബന്ധങ്ങൾ എഴുതിയതിനെ മാത്രം ഓർത്തുകൊണ്ടു് ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ദ്രോഹകരമാ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

യുള്ള ഈ സംഗതിയിൽ നിങ്ങളാരും ഒരിക്കലും അനുകൂലിക്കരുത് എ ന്ന് ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു. പ്രത്യേകാധികാരം പ്രയോഗിച്ച ഗവർ മ്മേൻറു ഇതു പാസ്സാക്കികൊള്ളട്ടെ. കൊച്ചിയിലെ പൊതുജനങ്ങള ടെ പ്രാതിനിദ്ധ്യം വഹിക്കുന്ന ഈ നിയമസഭ ഇതിനെ ശക്തിയായും എതിർക്കണം.

പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടെ പ്രാഥമികാവകാശമായ അഭിപ്രായപ്രകടന സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തെ തടയുവാനുള്ള ഒരു നിയമം നടപ്പാക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണം ഈ കൊച്ചീ രാജ്യത്ത് എന്ത് അപകടമുണ്ടായി? അത്യാവശ്യമായി വ ന്നാലല്ലാതെ നിയമശൃംഖലകൾ ക്രട്ടുവാൻ പാടില്ലാത്തതാണ്. ഏ റ്റവും ചുരുങ്ങിയ നിയമനിയന്ത്രണംകൊണ്ട് ഏറ്റവും സമാധാനപര മായി ജീവിക്കുവാൻ സാധിക്കുന്നതാണ് നാഗരികയുടെ ഉത്തമല ക്ഷണം.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Sir, I doubt whether there is any one on this side of the House who has at any time escaped or at least has not had the opportunity and the unpleasant task or occasion to stand the scurrilous attacks of the nefarious press. Therefore the motion for recommittal made from this side comes with all the more strength. (Hear, hear). Now, Sir, the question before us, is whether the laws in force in the State from of old are sufficient to meet the demands of the case. What is the new position that has arisen which has necessitated the Government thinking of giving the executive absolute power so to say to gag the press ? That is what it comes to. You have your provisions of the Penal Code which are sufficiently elastic and wide to cover all cases that you contemplate but then the difficulty for the Government is that the matter has to be taken to a Court of law and there all the procedure for a regular trial has to be gone through. That the Government wants to avoid. They want to give the executive officer the power to stop the circulation of newspapers. That, Sir, is putting the hands of the clock very much back. That is something we on this side of the House cannot look upon with equanimity. We do not say that the Press, if it is bad, should not be punished. We do not say that bad literature should be circulated among the boys, girls, women and men of the State. (Hear, hear). That should be put a stop to.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—How ?

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Are not the sections of the Penal Code sufficient for this ? Has not the Government seen the obscene publications sold everywhere in the State ? Has the finger of law moved against it? Have you not got section 270 of the Cochin Penal Code to stop such publications? Why is it that the Government do not take any steps ? Instead of doing that, is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

it proper on the part of the Government to come here and ask to give the executive officer absolute power and to say that he who is thereby affected has a right of appeal to the Chief Court. Very cheap terms they are! There is a right of appeal and if you go to exercise that right of appeal the difficulty will come. In the Press Regulation in Travancore as well as in British India there are also appeals to the High Courts. Why is it that the public opinion of Travancore and British India are against the provisions of this Regulation. Therefore, Sir, this is only a move, to give more power to the executive officer of the Government and thereby to control the right of expression of opinion which the public has. The papers that exist in the State, good, bad or indifferent will be absolute slaves of the District Magistrate or whoever in whom this power is vested under this Regulation. Such a measure adopted to give such vide powers to the executive officer can never be passed with the support of this Council.

Coming to the provisions themselves, it is my humble opinion that whatever may be the learned Government Advocate's opinion, the provisions are entirely insufficient to cover the cases contemplated. You may add them after recommittal. If you have the intention to stop all the nonsense that is going on according to you, then it is my humble opinion that the terms are entirely insufficient. You want only one thing; you want to give the District Magistrate executive power by which he may gag the whole press. There are absolutely no other provisions. Now let us take the several things that are stopped by this. Take an obscene publication for example. You have section 270 of the Penal Code. That is sufficiently large and wide. Take a seditious publication, and you have got a section in the Penal Code; an insulting publication, you have section 484. You punish a man for his guilt and nobody will repeat it. You hang a man for committing murder. Does murder stop by that? It is only deterrent. There is the enactment that murder shall not be committed. A man who commits murder will give his head to the gallows. Do you mean to say thereby that murder will stop for all times? Do you mean to say therefore that because murder is being committed nobody shall keep a weapon? Is it not your argument? Because A shot B the learned Government Advocate argues that nobody should possess a pistol. That is no argument. Now, Sir, let us see what is to be accomplished. Let us see whether there are not already weapons in the hands of the Government by which they can punish the offenders. Your provisions should be such that if a man offends against the laws of the State or does things that will affect the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

public peace, that man should be punished. Such things should be prevented. Now for sedition you have got your provision ; for obscene things you have got provisions, for insulting publications there are provisions and for creating communal disharmony you have got the Criminal Procedure Code. Has there been any instance in which any of these sections have been used when all these papers such as Vikatan, Rasikan, etc., have been publishing the dirtiest literature possible? Did the Government take any action ?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Several were prosecuted.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Then the effect of that has been seen in the dwindling of their numbers. Prosecute more and there is an end of it. Instead of that you want the whole power of controlling the press to be given in the hands of one executive officer taking it from the hands of the judiciary. That is our complaint. We do not want the Government not to take action against such papers for doing such things. The remedy is much more than the necessities of the case and it will create more evil than the good aimed at. Therefore I beg to support the motion for recommittal.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. സി. വക്കി.— സർ, ഇവിടെ ഈ നിയമത്തിന്റെ ദോഷവശങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി രണ്ടുമൂന്നു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർമാർ സംസാരിക്കയുണ്ടായി. ലാമെമ്പർ അവർകൾ പറഞ്ഞതു് ഇതു മറ്റു ചില സ്റ്റേറ്റുകളിൽ നടപ്പാക്കീട്ടുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടു് ഇവിടെയും വേണമെന്നാണ്. അങ്ങിനെ വല്ലതും ചെയ്യേണ്ടിവന്നാലും അതിൽ ചില രക്ഷാവ്യവസ്ഥകൾകൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. ആ രക്ഷാവ്യവസ്ഥകളിൽ.....

(As it was 3-30 the Adjournment motion was taken up for consideration.)

Adjournment Motion

re Plague in Mattancheri.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ— സർ, ഇപ്പോൾ ഗവർമ്മെൻറു പ്ലേഗ് നിവാരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി തുടങ്ങിയിരിക്കുന്ന പ്രവൃത്തികൾക്കു് ഈ നിയമസഭയെക്കൊണ്ടു സാധിക്കുന്ന സഹായങ്ങൾ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ മോഷന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം.

ഞാൻ കുത്തിവെച്ചിട്ടു്. ഗവർമ്മെൻറിന്റെ പ്ലേഗ് നിവാരണശ്രമങ്ങളിൽ സഹകരിക്കേണ്ട അവശ്യത്തെ പൊതുജനങ്ങളെ ഉൽബോധിപ്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ നടത്തുന്ന പത്രത്തിൽ രണ്ടുപ്രാവശ്യം മുഖപ്രസംഗം പരസ്യം ചെയ്തുണ്ടായി. ഇതിൽനിന്നെല്ലാം ഞാൻ ഗവർമ്മെൻറിനെ വിഷമിപ്പിക്കുകയല്ല, സഹായിക്കാനാണ്. ഈ പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുവന്നതെന്നു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നതാണ്.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly